



**Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC)
February 6-7, 2001
Portland, Oregon**

Meeting Summary

The Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC) held its 18th semi-annual meeting February 6-7, 2001, in Portland, Oregon. Attending were 125 representatives from national, State, Tribal and local government organizations, industry and professional groups and other interested parties/DOE programs who meet to address a variety of issues related to DOE's radioactive materials transportation activities and provide continuing and improved coordination between DOE, other levels of government, and outside organizations with DOE transportation-related responsibilities.

PLENARY I – TRANSCOM 2000 PRESENTATION (February 6)

Bobby Sanchez, U.S. DOE National Transportation Program, Albuquerque, gave a short presentation on TRANSCOM 2000. Key features include:

- System is more user friendly
- 5 minute intervals for location (DOE hopes to reduce that timing to 2 to 3 minutes)
- Improved mapping function
- Scheduler feature that produces a bill of lading, resulting in one set of information
- Group passwords
- Multiple security levels

Tasks remaining to be completed:

- OMB A-130 security plan tested and approved
- The Communications Center is fully staffed with training schedule to begin February 20 in Albuquerque
- Implementation of User Cut-over Plan

The Oak Ridge TRANSCOM Center won't be shut down until the Albuquerque TRANSCOM Communications Center is capable of handling the workload

PLENARY I I– RAIL ISSUES PANEL (February 7)

Kevin Blackwell of the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) gave the introduction and welcome to the plenary session.

Bob Fronczak of the Association of American Railroads (AAR) was the first speaker. His presentation was entitled “*Performance Standard for SNF Trains*.” Questions on the standards were asked at the end of the presentation:

Will West Valley shipments travel at higher speeds?

The standard is written to allow for track speed, which is up to 70 mph for freight. Casks are designed to withstand a considerable amount of force, and AAR’s analysis of various NRC reports addressing cask crash worthiness indicates that any release would be localized.

Therefore, risk of an injury would be minimal. In fact, the Navy just relaxed their speed restriction. The AAR thinking is to use the OT55 speed restriction, which is standard for large quantities of the most hazardous materials the railroads transport.

Thor Strong asked about full scale testing?

Right now for Chapter XI testing (for all new freight cars, actual cars go through tests at AAR’s Transportation Technology Center in Pueblo, Colorado), the rail car has to show it can meet certain performance requirements. *The Performance Standard for SNF Trains* requires all cars in a train to meet performance requirements slightly more restrictive than the current Chapter XI requirements.

Are there collision tests?

Key is this is a roadworthiness test. AAR is not considering redoing the cask test. AAR is interested in minimizing the derailment of cars.

What is the state of the rail beds; are some in disrepair?

AAR has standards and each company has the same type of standards. Track is inspected with rail vehicles. Do they catch everything? No, but they have minimized derailments. Safety has improved significantly in the last 20 years since the rail industry was deregulated. Derailments per million train miles have dropped 71 percent since 1980 and 27 percent since 1990.

Kevin Blackwell of FRA explained that FRA has a Safety Compliance Oversight Plan (SCOP) for spent nuclear fuel (SNF) transport. Under the SCOP, the track will receive an inspection prior to the first shipment of any shipping campaign, and periodically thereafter. Best interest is to keep the trains on the tracks. FRA has oversight responsibility. Normal routine inspections are performed by the railroad on a daily basis.

Do these standards have force of law?

It is an interchange standard, so all interchange traffic has to comply unless the interchanging railroads agree not to. Railroads could choose to operate in a different way, but it is unlikely that they would. A single railroad could choose to ship something outside the interchange standard on their own railroad, but that, too, is unlikely.

Kevin asked Bob about the circular. It is not out for distribution – not finalized yet. To get a copy, subscribe to the AAR circular newsletter system.

Jim Nicolosi, Safety and Ecology Corporation, was the next presenter. He gave a presentation on SNF emergency response.

Judith Holm (DOE/NTPA) asked if his company has responded to any actual accidents?

The response was yes, one spill.

Judith further clarified that her question was about special issues/problems in responding.

The final presenter was Norman Smith from Hulcher. They have 53 product divisions across nation and have equipment placed to respond to emergency situations.

Kevin Blackwell commented that FRA does not do emergency response.

Kevin was going to give "Operation Respond" presentation but ran out of time.

TOPIC GROUP MEETINGS

Transportation Protocols Topic Group

The sixth meeting of the DOE Transportation Protocols Topic Group was held on February 6, 2001. Patricia Armijo and Carol Peabody (DOE) led the discussions. Participants reviewed the final drafts of the protocols introduction, glossary and acronyms, as well as a matrix of comments submitted and their disposition. Ms. Peabody outlined the steps DOE was following to institutionalize the protocols into the directives system, including review and comment by DOE's Offices of Management and Administration (MA) and General Counsel (GC). Some terminology and implementation changes may be required depending on the appropriate procedures; however, it was agreed to keep the group informed of developments and to provide the final drafts to the group when submitted to MA for entry into the directives system.

Someone questioned whether the group would dissolve since the protocols drafts were essentially complete. Following discussion, participants decided the group should remain active until the path forward is more clear and the process for updating the documents is defined.

Action Items:

1. Any major comments on the introduction, glossary and acronyms should be submitted to Patricia Armijo by Friday, Feb. 16, 2001.
2. Topic Group will continue as active until the July 2001 TEC meeting (location TBD).
3. Topic Group members will be sent a final copy of the protocols when they are submitted to MA (probably on or about the end of March 2001).
4. A conference call to review MA's comments on the submittal and next steps will be held after the comments are received.

Detailed notes can be found at <http://twilight.saic.com/newtec/trans.html>.

Training and Medical Training Issues Topic Group (TMIT)

The TMIT met on February 6-7, 2001 and the following topics were covered:

- Review of FEMA Training and Other Products:

- The TMIT viewed the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) videotape on how to perform pre-hospital emergency medical services at the scene of an accident involving radiological material. The course will be piloted at the Emergency Management Institute in May 2001, then prepared as final and distributed in June 2001. The TMIT provided comments on the video.
- The TMIT also reviewed FEMA's Fundamentals Course for Radiological Response. FEMA plans to provide this training in modules.
- The contents of and the methods for using the Compendium of Federal Radiological Training and the accompanying training matrix developed by FEMA and EM-24 were described. Copies of the compendium on CD ROM were provided to those interested.
- Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Medical Training: An overview of the medical training used by WIPP was provided. The course is for a hospital response involving a radiological incident. Each state can play an active role in determining the training outcomes. Representatives from Colorado and Arizona will continue to assist in improving the quality of the training.
- Decontamination Procedure: The group reviewed the draft decontamination paper, which has been presented to the Federal Radiological Preparedness Coordination Committee (January 2001). The new procedure presents three options for decontamination (wet, dry, and decontamination with surveying). The discussion on the procedure dealt with specifying required respiratory protection, listing phone numbers for making notifications, identifying the resources available, preparing and retaining records for documenting exposures, and developing a flow chart.
- WIPP/MERRTT Merger: A proposed path for merging the WIPP (State and Tribal Emergency Preparedness) training with Modular Emergency Response Radiological Transportation Training (MERRTT) was discussed. The proposal retains the MERRTT modular structure and format. When the merger is completed, the modules would be presented to Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) for review, as required by WIPP. Four volunteers (Tom Clawson, Bill Craig, Bill Lent, and Walt Stoy) offered to assist the focus group in developing a path forward.
- Review of the Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) Web Site (www.em.doe.gov/otem): The group watched a demonstration of the updated TEPP web site. The site provides planning and training tools plus other information (e.g., TEPP newsletters, case histories, and the MERRTT master schedule). The newest feature, case histories, was explained. The case histories provide information on radioactive material incidents. This information can be used to reinforce training and enhance exercises.
- MERRTT CEU's: Volpentest Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Training and Education Center (HAMMER) obtained continuing education units (CEUs) for MERRTT through Washington State University, however, the cost is prohibitive for most responders. An overview of other methods for awarding CEUs was provided. Two types of CEUs – traditional and International Association of Continuing Education and Training accredited – can be awarded. The group discussed the various methods for obtaining CEUs and continuing education hours (CEHs) and the numerous state licensing and nationally accredited organizations

that can authorize them. Each group member will ask their organization for a recommendation on how to proceed with obtaining CEUs.

Action Items

1. Provide comments on the pre-hospital training video and the proposed *Fundamentals Course for Radiological Response* to FEMA (March 1, 2001).
2. Incorporate comments on the draft decontamination procedure and distribute for final review (March 1, 2001).
3. Develop path forward for WIPP/MERRTT merger (March 1, 2001).
4. Complete merger of the WIPP/MERRTT training materials (July 1, 2001).
5. Obtain individual organizational recommendations on CEU's (May 1, 2001).

Tribal Issues Topic Group

Issues discussed during this meeting included a review of action items from the December conference call, an update on the proposed DOE Consolidated Transportation Grant, Federal global information system (GIS) resources/information sharing, Implementation of the American Indian/Native Alaskan Policy and DOE's Employee Guide for Working with Tribal Nations.

In response to group discussions on available Federal GIS resources, Ed Liebow (Environmental Health & Social Policy Center) made a presentation entitled *GIS and Remote Sensing*. A brief dialog on the importance of protecting sensitive Tribal information followed.

Next on the agenda was discussion on the Implementation Plan for the DOE American Indian and Native Alaskan Policy. The Secretary of Energy issued the revised policy in the fall of 2000, after receiving broad input from Tribes. The new Policy can be found on the Web at <http://www.ci.doe.gov/indianbk.pdf>. It was noted that the Implementation Plan for the Policy needs to be developed with the Tribes, but no firm schedule has been established at this point. Kevin Clarke (DOE/RL) applauded Robert Holden's (NCAI) efforts in development of the new Policy and stated that it is already having a positive impact at Richland.

Robert Holden distributed copies of two articles:

- "Challenges for Tribal Emergency Management Programs" from the November 2000 *IAEM Bulletin*
 - "When Nuclear Waste is Last Resort" from the January 17, 2001 edition of *Indian Country Today*
- Copies are available from Wilda Portner (SAIC) at 505-842-7818 if you missed the meeting.

Martha Crosland (DOE, EM) announced the new publication, *Working with Indian Tribal Nations: A Guide for DOE Employees* (December 2000) is now available on the Web at: <http://www.em.doe.gov/public/tribal/history.html>.

- The DOE Consolidated Grant Process was then discussed. DOE has made no final decisions. Helen Belencan (DOE/EM) has become a key player at DOE Headquarters to assist with the policy coordination for the proposed grant, which has been worked through DOE senior management. The group walked through the draft Framework document for the Grant and those present expressed issues and concerns regarding tribal relationships with DOE and the proposed grant. Comments on the Framework document should be sent to Judith Bradbury, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) by March 7. Her email address is judith.bradbury@pnl.gov and her fax number is 301-862-1595. Major discussion of the document was reserved for the Consolidated Grant Topic Group meeting (reference the expanded Tribal Group summary on the TEC Web site). A meeting with

Tribal representatives will be held in the spring of 2001 to discuss further the proposed grant and to obtain views from potential Tribal government recipients.

The Grant discussion concluded the session. The next conference call date and time was not decided on at the meeting.

Action Items:

1. Distribute International Institute for Indigenous Resource Management fall meeting summary/participants list.
2. Communicate Tribal consultation concerns to DOE Center for Risk Excellence (CRE).
3. Comments on Lessons Learned Report draft to H. Westra or W. Portner (April 15, 2001).
4. Grant Framework document comments to J. Bradbury.

Communications Topic Group

The meeting started with a discussion about the presentation for the Local Government Network, the Guide to Low-Level Waste, and routing, risk communication and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Qs and As databases and bibliographies. Input was sought on how to use our Transportation Communication Products that were created by the group over the past year. The products are: Key Message Statements on Transportation, Risk Communication Annotated Bibliography, Routing Annotated Bibliography, EIS Comment and Response Project, Sample Approach to Explaining Communication Risk, and Best Practices for the U.S. Department of Energy's Radioactive Materials Transportation Public Information Programs. Adding the Local Government Network Presentation and the Guide to Low-Level Waste to the suite of risk communication information products was also suggested.

Patricia Armijo and Martha Crosland (DOE) welcomed the group, provided an overview of the Topic Group's recent activities, and described the afternoon's brainstorming session on the transportation communication products implementation plan.

Wilda Portner (SAIC) gave an update on the draft Local Government Network presentation, which has been loaded onto the TEC website (<http://twilight.saic.com/newtec>). It includes about 40 slides on DOE transportation of non-weapons related radiological materials. A comment form for use by Communications Topic Group members was sent under separate cover. Comments on the draft presentation are due to Ms. Portner by March 23, 2001. The presentation was put together as a result of a need expressed by members of the Energy Communities Alliance to assist elected officials in providing information to constituents and answering their questions on DOE transportation. Lisa Sattler asked for an example of the types of comments received on the presentation to date. Ms. Portner said some commenters said there was too much irrelevant information and that the presentation needed specific information on the percentage of DOE shipments relative to all annual radioactive materials shipments.

The draft National Safety Council (NSC) Guide to Low-Level Waste was distributed to the Communications Topic Group for review in early January. Martha, by way of background, explained that the Guide, which has been under development for about a year, has been through several review cycles and that the NSC is looking forward to TEC Communications Topic Group comments. The NSC is also in the process of updating WIPP information products. Martha Crosland asked TEC members to let her know if any other information products are needed. There is a possibility that a booklet on DOE emergency preparedness efforts may be forthcoming from the Council.

Phil Paull (CSG-ERC) asked for whom the *Guide to Low-Level Waste* was intended. Ms. Crosland replied that it would be mainly for the media to use because they are a primary conduit to the public. Mr. Paull said he that he asked the question because he believes it commendable to develop documents for information purposes, but asked if the Guide was developed because existing information was lacking. He further clarified his question by asking if the new Guide had anything to do with the future potential for more low-level waste transportation over highways. Ms. Crosland answered that it took longer than anticipated to develop the booklet, and originally, DOE had wanted to have the document out with the issuance of the recent EIS Record of Decision. Other comments on the Guide received during the meeting included: the Guide downplayed the amount of waste that will be coming to Nevada and Hanford, and how issuance of the document fits into the phase out of the DOE Low-Level Waste Office. Ms. Crosland said the focus on the Guide was DOE Environmental Management low-level waste but commercial waste was included to provide a complete picture. In addition, Ken Niles (Oregon Office of Energy) commented that the Guide shouldn't be considered final until environmental documentation is completed concerning amount of waste, where it is going, number of shipments, etc. Ms. Crosland said an acknowledgement of this would be important to add to the Guide. Comments need to be sent to Ms. Portner by February 28, 2001. Ms. Portner will compile the comments and submit to DOE.

Nancy Bennett [Transportation Resource Exchange Center (T-REX)] reported on the Alliance for Transportation Research (ATR) efforts that include annotated bibliographies and searchable databases. Annotated risk communication and routing bibliographies are available on ATR's website: www.trex-center.org. The purpose of the bibliographies is to summarize all relevant documents, commentaries, policies, and law on the issue of DOE shipment routing, and to provide a "one-stop shop" for information on risk communication. The routing issues bibliography grew out of the EIS comment/response database project after it was discovered that the number one comment received from DOE stakeholders during EIS processes was about routing.

The EIS comment/response database project now has about 1,000 entries. DOE's responses to similar questions during an EIS process have been fairly consistent, but the information is useful because it helps identify situations in which answers to questions could be improved. A suggestion was made to create a two-tier system for search on the comment/response database. In addition, a specific routing database will be available on the web shortly. Ms. Bennett also said within the next month the databases would have more search capabilities. Mr. Paull wanted clarification on how "searchable" the databases were and Ms. Bennett said they could be searched by author name, keyword, etc.

Mr. Niles asked what kind of activity the T-REX website was getting. Ms. Bennett replied that it has had over 9,000 hits in a single month with a monthly average of 5,000 hits. The news pages are used frequently, especially radioactive materials transportation news. The DOE Answers to Your Questions Transportation Brochure gets printed out frequently and the recently added page in Spanish is becoming more popular. A list serve capability will be available beginning February 14, 2001, on the T-REX site.

The remainder of the meeting was used to gather input from Topic Group members concerning ways to best ensure internal and external audiences are aware of and use the transportation communication products once they are finalized. A draft implementation plan will be sent to the group for review in mid-March, followed by a Topic Group conference call at the end of the month. The work of the group (i.e., risk communication products) will be presented at the July general membership TEC meeting. Finally, the group expressed a desire to go on hiatus until a further need arises for their group to reconvene.

Action Items:

1. Lisa Sattler will submit draft Best Practices for the U.S. Department of Energy's Radioactive Materials Transportation Public Information Programs to Beth Hale (SAIC) for distribution to Topic Group (February 19, 2001).
2. Topic Group will provide comments to W. Portner on draft Guide to Low-Level Waste (March 14, 2001).
3. P. Armijo and B. Hale will submit draft Transportation communication products implementation plan to Topic Group for review (March 9, 2001).
4. Topic Group will provide comments to W. Portner on draft Local Government Network Presentation (March 23, 2001).
5. Topic Group will participate in a conference call to provide input on draft implementation plan (March 2001).
6. P. Armijo and Topic Group to present Transportation communication products implementation plan, and fact sheets to entire TEC organization at July meeting (July 2001).

Consolidated Grant Topic Group

The Consolidated Grant Topic Group met on February 6 and 7. The focus of discussion was the Draft *Framework* document, which had been distributed to members, together with Appendix B (issues matrix), prior to the meeting. The document was also discussed in the Tribal Topic group on February 6. Helen Belencan (DOE-EM), who has been coordinating HQ activities related to the grant, and Judith Holm (NTP-Albuquerque) facilitated an overview and discussion of the draft *Framework* during the first afternoon of the Consolidated Grant Topic group meeting. During the second morning, Judith Holm facilitated the discussion of action items and proposed next steps, with assistance from Tracy Mustin and other DOE members. Primary topics and agreements were:

Comments and Issues related to the Grant

A detailed summary of members' comments and issues is provided in the Topic Group summary. They have been categorized according to introductory process issues and the six key issues listed in the *Framework*:

- Introductory and process issues
- Funding approach
- Eligibility
- Mechanism for distributing funds to participants
- Addressing Tribal needs and preferences
- Allowable activities
- Application criteria

Planned Revisions to the *Framework*

Agreement was reached on the following near-term changes to the document:

1. Restructure the document to include separate discussion of State and Tribal issues (note: because of the overlap of issues, complete separation was not feasible; however, additional discussion has been included related to DOE's trust responsibility and how Tribal needs and concerns might be distinct from those of States).
2. Clarify and define terms.

3. Revise Table 1, which shows DOE shipments of radioactive materials and estimated DOE funding allocations to States and Tribes.
4. Clarify and explain the formal consultation process in Section 3.

Action Items

1. TEC members will provide additional written comments on the *Framework* to Judith Bradbury (Judith.Bradbury@pnl.gov) within 30 days (March 7); policy questions should be directed to Helen Belencan (Helen.Belencan@em.doe.gov) or Judith Holm (jholm@doeal.gov)
2. DOE will provide a revised *Framework* by mid-April, before the four State regional groups hold their meetings. The revised document will incorporate: changes agreed upon during the meeting and DOE responses to written comments.

Next Steps

1. Topic Group calls will be scheduled approximately monthly. Members will work on the agenda for an inter-regional State workshop, which is currently planned to coincide with the TEC meeting in July.
2. State regional group meetings, scheduled between April and June, will include time set aside for DOE presentation and discussion of grant issues. DOE will provide data for discussion at the meetings.
3. DOE will consult with TEC Tribal representatives concerning next steps in Tribal discussions and meetings. It is anticipated that a similar consultation process will be held with Tribes as with States.
4. The agenda for the planned inter-regional workshop will include:
 - Topics and issues for further discussion
 - Allocation factors and data analysis
 - Requirements and performance standards
 - Administrative issues and allowable activities

Summary of TEC Meeting Evaluations

The majority of those who submitted their evaluation forms rated the TEC Winter 2001 meeting as “good” or “excellent”. Comments stated the sessions were well organized, arranged and administered, groups worked well together and there was time to get work done. On the downside, although the AAR presentation was well received, comments on the rail issues panel were that it was more a marketing pitch rather than relevant information for the States.

In summary, registration and distribution of information via the Internet and email is working well with the exception of multiple or large documents. It was suggested that the larger documents (10 pages or more) be mailed ahead of time, especially if they are to be used for meeting materials by the Topic Group(s).

The Program Update Exhibits and set-up were considered useful but it was suggested someone be available to answer questions about the exhibits, the information be relevant and current, and additional exhibits be added at future TEC meetings.

The Topic Group sessions were considered very useful and most respondents believed their issues were adequately addressed although they would like to have had additional time to discuss Consolidated Grant issues such as Tribal concerns, allocation factors and overall funding level. There was strong support for

the State inter-regional workshops that will be held in order to finalize guidance and funding level for requirements. Those who participated in the Training and Medical Training Issues Topic Group stated it was nicely done, productive and the lively discussion was wonderful, but the FEMA training video was poor. Issues that need to be addressed are CEU issues, moving forward with videos to support MERRTT, and review and consideration of options for the WIPP/MERRTT merger.

Suggested emerging issues for TEC to address are rail inspection and shipments, OCRWM shipments to repository, consolidated grant-implications, future funding for States, Tribes, local jurisdictions, notification of high level waste (HLW) and classified wastes, site recommendations for Yucca Mountain, low level waste (LLW) characterization, consistency of training to meet national/professional certifications standards, specific needs for special shipping campaigns.